

BUCK JONES ROAD WIDENING PROJECT CITIZEN CONCERNS

| <u>Comment Nature</u> | | <u>Specifics</u> | <u>Response</u> |
|-----------------------|---------------------|--|---|
| 1. | Jurisdiction | a. Is BJR a City Road? | Yes, BJR is maintained by the City of Raleigh. |
| | | b. Why is the City choosing to widen BJR rather than Jones-Franklin? | BJR was placed on the City's CIP to address growth and safety issues. |
| | | c. Will the City be responsible for cleaning and maintaining sidewalk? | The sidewalk will be inside the proposed right of way so therefore owned and maintained by the City of Raleigh. City of Raleigh will typically handle snow removal operations from the roadway surfaces, but not typically the sidewalks. |
| | | d. Why this project since it benefits Cary and not Raleigh. | The project benefits both Cary and Raleigh Citizens equally by providing an improved roadway for citizens to travel to and from home to employment centers, shopping centers and other destinations. |
| | | e. Was the BJR project considered in the J-F Special Study Area? | Do not have access to the Jones-Franklin Study, but typically study areas are evaluated taking into account the full development for transportation facilities according to their designation on the thoroughfare plan. |
| 2. | Bike Lanes | a. How many riders will use the bike lanes once built? | No direct ridership predictions are available, but the City's current policy is to provide bike lanes along all thoroughfares to allow for multi-modal choices of transportation. |
| | | b. Will having bike lanes encourage riders to use the facility? | Indirectly, the availability of safer, well-planned bike facilities will allow travelers to choose other alternative modes of transportation including biking. |
| | | c. Will the City connect the bike lanes proposed | Currently, the bike lanes included on this project will |

| | | | |
|-----------|-------------------|--|---|
| | | on BJR to facilities on Western Blvd.? | end at Jones-Franklin Road, but future projects may address the extension of these facilities to adjacent corridors. |
| | | d. Citizens felt that the bike lanes were not necessary since there is not much riders using the facility now. | The lower presence of riders along this corridor likely has a direct correlation with the absence of sidewalks, inadequate roadway geometry and bike lanes. |
| 3. | Turn Lanes | a. Concern that cars will use the turn lanes to pass Buses. | Cars utilizing center turning lanes to pass stopped transit buses or school buses are committing a traffic violation. These types of violations can be better addressed through more visible enforcement presence, better project signage, and more public education. |
| | | b. Additional lanes will allow cars to speed. | The addition of the center turn lane benefits the flow of traffic and reduces the likelihood of rear end collisions by eliminating the need for through traffic to slow and/or stop behind turning traffic. Speeding violations will not have a direct correlation to the free flow characteristics of the improved corridor. Better and more effective enforcement and signage combined with public awareness and education will combat excessive speeding trends. |
| | | c. A left turn lane is needed at Old Farm, Bashford and Field Spring. | As part of the project the left turn lane will provide turn lane storage along BJR for those intersections. A left turn lane is being added from Bashford Road onto BJR. Current and future traffic volumes do not indicate the need for a separate left turn lane from Old Farm Road onto BJR. Field Spring Lane is beyond the limits of this current project. |
| | | d. A left turn lane and signal is needed at Bashford. | The current traffic volumes at the Bashford Road intersection do not meet the MUTCD guidelines for requiring a traffic signal at this time. However, following completion of the roadway project the City |

| | | | |
|-----------|----------------------|--|---|
| | | | will continue to monitor the intersection. Following these periodic studies if a signal is eventually warranted in the future, then it would be added at that time. |
| 4. | Appurtenances | a. What impacts will there be to mailboxes, trees, plants, water and gas services to individual parcels? | Various project features will be impacted by the widening and/or the construction of sidewalk facilities. These impacts will be addressed in the project design or adequately compensated as part of the real estate negotiation and settlement parts of the project. |
| | | b. Find ways to save large trees along the project. | The project typical section has been minimized to the amount allowed and still staying consistent with the facility designation as a minor thoroughfare. Grade controls have been used to limit project footprint only to what is necessary to construct the roadway. |
| 5. | Assessments | a. Citizens expressed concern over how to pay assessments on a fixed income. | The City of Raleigh has financing options available to address structured payments for property assessments. |
| | | b. Citizens do not want assessments as part of the project. | As approved by the City Council, the City of Raleigh policy has indicated this project as an assessable project. |
| | | c. Will property taxes go up or down based on the completion of the project? | There is no direct correlation to the impact of this project on property values. There may be some offsetting of value for the loss of physical property area by improved street frontage and better and more uniform appearance from the curb and gutter and sidewalk amenities. |
| 6. | Horizontal | a. Concern over limited sight distance and accidents from the S-Curve near Bashford Road. | This situation has been improved by flattening of the horizontal curvature in these areas and improving sight distance by removing visual obstructions that encroach into the line of sight of drivers along the corridor. |
| 7. | Drainage | a. There was Citizen Concern over adding | Directly attributable to the roadway widening, some |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | <p>additional impervious areas to BJR and their impact to the watershed.</p> | <p>additional impervious areas will be added to BJR Some minor increases in peak runoff rates will occur downstream at the drainage system outfalls. The City of Raleigh currently operates under an approved NPDES Phase II stormwater permit with the State.</p> <p>Based on the date this project started design (April 2010), it is exempt from compliance with stormwater requirements addressing pre- and post-construction flow attenuation, however, the additional amount of impervious areas added to the project will not result in a dramatic increase in stormwater flows for the design storms. As part of the stormwater design process, the design team will evaluate existing stormwater flow conditions and compare them with the proposed improvements and determine if the downstream receiving channels for outfalls will be adequate to handle the estimated future flow. If downstream receiving channels are not adequate to handle the change in flows for the proposed project, then channel improvements or other means of stabilization can be incorporated into the project.</p> |
| | | <p>b. Citizens were concerned about increasing flooding in their yards and into the apartment complexes.</p> | <p>The design team will identify areas of concern that have been expressed and evaluate those locations to see if they are directly affected by the project. Downstream impacts to receiving drainage systems significantly far downstream, such as Walnut Creek are better addressed through separate stormwater improvement projects with more direct impact to the system. The contribution of the increase in drainage flows along BJR is a relatively small contribution to</p> |

| | | | |
|-----------|------------------------|---|--|
| | | | the overall drainage area contributing to the flooding problems along Walnut Creek. The improvements to attenuate flow along BJR will be expensive and require significant real estate impacts to the effected parcels near existing outfalls along the project. |
| | | c. Citizens had concerns over increasing flooding at the Church. | Flooding issues at specific locations will be evaluated more in depth during drainage design. |
| 8. | Communication | a. Citizens requested additional communication and sharing of information and decisions as the plans are developed. | City will provide regular updates, advanced notification of public meetings and other pertinent project data to citizens via the City of Raleigh's website. |
| | | b. At future public meetings, consider the use of microphones and mediators. | At the venue for the 25% design public meeting, the facilitator used a sound system to present the project and to answer questions given from the citizens. The facilitator and City staff typically serves as mediators to field respective questions and provide responses. Questions are typically re-iterated so that all members in the audience can clearly hear the question. |
| | | c. Several Citizens liked the location of the first public meeting at All Saints Church due to its close proximity to the project corridor. | Agree. This venue suits the average size and proximity of the Citizens interested in the project. |
| 9. | Traffic Calming | a. Citizens have requested consideration of a potential roundabout at Bashford Road to calm and slow traffic flow. | As part of the project concerns expressed at the 25% Design Public Meeting, the staff undertook a study of the feasibility of incorporating Roundabouts into the project design. The engineering impact and cost evaluation has been completed and supported recommending inclusion of roundabouts at both Farmgate Road and Bashford Road to be included into the final project design. The formal decision to ultimately include roundabouts into the project will be put forward and discussed at the 65% Design Public |

| | | | |
|------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | | Meeting. Public concern and/or support of inclusion of these traffic measures will be included in the final determination to move forward and implement these improvements into final design. The inclusion of these features coupled with other traffic calming measures along the project as part of transit improvements, serve to break up the free flow nature of the project corridor and reduce vehicle speeds. |
| | | b. Citizens would like to see a roundabout to maintain the residential aspect of the project corridor. | Although the roundabout will provide a more pleasing residential feature, the impacts will be more significant than improving the intersection through traditional means. |
| 10. | Traffic Counts | a. Citizens requested doing additional traffic counts in the fall and winter to note fluctuations in traffic flow from school and college being in and out. | City may elect to obtain additional traffic counts at a later time to determine if traffic flow is dramatically affected by schools being in session or out of session. |
| 11. | Sidewalks | a. Several Citizens like the concept of having sidewalks on both sides of the project. | Agree. The project typical section is consistent with current City policies and practices. |
| | | b. Some groups of Citizens wanted the sidewalk only on one side of the project. Most in opposition preferred sidewalk on the commercial/multi-family side of the project. | Having sidewalk on one side of the project will require all pedestrians from one side of BJR to cross BJR to reach the sidewalk and continue to walk to their destinations along the corridor. Having sidewalk on both sides will allow pedestrians to travel the entire corridor safely out of traffic without necessarily having to cross BJR. |
| | | c. The Citizens asked about sidewalks one only one side, would they be required to pay assessments for sidewalk on their side. | Sidewalk assessments for new projects have now been eliminated per a recent policy change approved by City Council; therefore, sidewalk assessments are no longer applicable to this project. |
| 12. | Parking Issues | a. There was a noted concern at a few locations where multi-family units have pull-in parking | These areas have been evaluated and some solutions can be created to provide for the required parking by |

| | | | |
|------------|---------------------|--|---|
| | | adjacent to the existing BJR and if there would be a loss of that parking with the widening. | code. These solutions will require additional survey information and evaluation of legal deed limitations of providing access to the rear of parcels via dedicated private access easements for adjacent parcels. |
| 13. | Signal Needs | a. Several Citizens felt there should be a traffic signal at Farm Gate Road and BJR. | The current traffic volumes at the Farm Gate intersection do not meet the MUTCD guidelines for requiring a traffic signal at this time. However, following completion of the roadway project the City will continue to monitor the intersection. Following these periodic studies if a signal is eventually warranted in the future, then it would be added at that time. |
| | | | |
| | | | |